

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google<sup>™</sup> books

<http://books.google.com>



1607

3822







# **SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.**

1607/3322

## **THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE**

**ON THE ABOVE SUBJECT EXAMINED AND ASSERTED**

**IN**

## **A LECTURE**

**DELIVERED AT**

**KINGSCOURT, COUNTY CAVAN,**

**ON WEDNESDAY, 7<sup>TH</sup> APRIL, 1841,**

**BY**

**EDWARD NORMAN, A. M.,**

*Priest of the Catholic Church of Ireland, Curate of Enniskillen,  
Diocese of Meath.*

---

**DUBLIN:**

**PRINTED BY GOODWIN, SON AND NETHERCOTT,  
75, Marlborough-street.**

**MDCCCXLI.**

# ADDRESS

TO

THE TEACHERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE IRISH SOCIETY.

---

DEAR FRIENDS,

Many of you having so kindly and warmly united your requests to those of other friends, whose good opinion I highly value, that I should commit to paper my thoughts upon the subject which occupied our attention on Wednesday evening, the 7th of April last ; I have endeavoured to comply with such request, trusting that the perusal of it may be instrumental, under God, in building up, in your most holy faith, such of you as have already been led to see the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, and to join that branch of the Church Catholic which is established in this kingdom ; and praying that such of you as are still in subjection to an Italian Bishop, may be led, by the Holy Spirit, seriously to lay to heart the facts here brought forward, and that you may be strengthened by that same Spirit, "without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy," to cast from you all the false confidences in which the church of Rome teaches you to trust, and to flee for refuge and comfort to that only hope which is set before you in the gospel of the blessed Jesus. This gospel is proclaimed freely and faithfully from the pulpit of the Catholic Church of Ireland—a church which has continually protested against the influence of any *foreign* prince, power, state, or potentate, being exerted over her.

I remain,

Your faithful friend,

EDWARD NORMAN.

## SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

*"When Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."*—GALATIANS ii. 11.—*(Douay Version.)*

You may remark, my brethren, in the verse selected for our text, that there is a slight difference between it and the passage as it appears in the Authorized Version—the name *Cephas* being substituted for *Peter*, though it is the latter in the original Greek; but it would bear too strongly against the "supremacy of the Pope," (the subject for consideration this evening) if "*Peter*" were left in, and so the alteration was considered quite allowable, in order to prevent plain readers of the Scriptures from seeing the plain force of the passage.

This doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy may appear unimportant to many, especially after the various interesting and valuable lectures, which have been delivered from this place, during the preceding weeks of this season; but I conceive it to be far from being so—it is of the utmost importance—I look upon it as almost the turning point of the whole controversy between the Catholic Church and the Church of Rome; for if it be true that the Pope has a Supremacy, and that we are bound implicitly to obey him in all things, whether of doctrine or discipline; if it be the case, as Bellarmine, one of the principal champions of the Papacy, asserts, that *if the Pope declared virtue to be vice, and vice virtue, we should believe him*; surely, if such be the case, all who refuse to submit to his authority must be in a state of rebellion against him, and if his power be as great as his advocates claim for him, his opponents can have no hope for eternity.

Such being the importance of the doctrine, I shall endeavour to show you what the doctrine really is; and here we have an advantage, which upon many other points we have not—that of knowing what the real sentiments of the Church of Rome are upon the mat-



ter. On other subjects of controversy so much difference of opinion has arisen amongst her own advocates, and so many anathemas on all sides, notwithstanding her boasted unity, that it is sometimes a matter of some difficulty to discover her sentiments; here, however, it is different; I shall now read to you from the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, what every Romanist is *obliged to believe*, and then show you from different Catechisms, what every Roman Catholic child in this kingdom is actually *taught* upon the subject. The Creed of Pope Pius says—"I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." Here is the *claim* of the Roman Church. We next proceed to the *teaching* founded on this claim. To discover this I have procured several Catechisms, or "Abridgments of the Christian Doctrine," as they are called, which are in use in the various dioceses in Ireland. Butler's, Doyle's, Devereux's, and the one from which I am about to quote, as I find it to be that most approved in this place—Plunkett's—and it is a remarkable fact, that all these differ, more or less, from each other. It is very remarkable, I repeat, that while the Church of Ireland has all her little ones instructed in the same Catechism, which has been in continual use since she cast from her the errors introduced into her system during the dark ages—while the children of the Church of Scotland are all initiated into the principles of her faith from the "Shorter Catechism;" *the Church of Rome with all her infallibility, has never yet given to her children a short compendium of her faith*, but leaves it to the private interpretation of each individual Bishop or body of divines in one place, to draw up what he or they may consider most suitable for the situation, in which their lot may be cast. This enables them to act according as expediency may direct, in one place softening down their doctrines, in another putting forth all the claims, which the most tyrannical of their Popes ever invented—scrupling to make an alteration in the com-

mandments of God: thus—while in the Catechisms which they publish in Ireland, they omit the second commandment, which forbids the veneration or worship of images, in some parts of England and Scotland they act differently, fearing lest the fact of the people being generally better acquainted with God's word would lead them to discover the curtailment. The doctrines taught in this place from Plunkett's Catechism are these—

LESSON XI—"Q. What do you mean by the true Church?

"A. The Congregation of the Faithful, united in the same faith, sacraments, and sacrifice, under one visible head.

"Q. How do you call the true Church?

"A. The Roman Catholic Church.

"Q. Are all *obliged* to be of the true Church?

"A. Yes.

"Q. Why are all obliged to be of the true Church?

"A. *Because no man can be saved out of it.*"

Here is the doctrine inculcated into the minds of the children of your Roman Catholic neighbours and friends—and remember, that there is not a Romish servant in one of your houses, who is not thus taught, that there is no salvation for a Protestant!

I now hold in my hand another little book, called "The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine," printed by and for the [Roman] Catholic Book Society, Essex-Bridge, Dublin, and principally intended for the use of those, who, denying the Catholic faith, and turning their backs upon the word of the living God, have been induced to embrace the system of Romanism—it says in page 52—

"Q. What is the Catholic doctrine as to the Pope's supremacy?

"A. It is comprised in these two Articles, 1st, that "St. Peter, by divine commission, was head of the Church under Christ—2ndly, that the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, as successor to St. Peter, is, at present, head of the Church, and Christ's Vicar upon earth."

Here then, we have the doctrine of the Roman Church plainly set forth—first, claiming a supremacy for St. Peter, and then, a like supremacy for the Bishop of

Rome, to whom all Christians are expected to be subject. These two points then I shall now endeavour to controvert, and may the Lord, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy, enable me to do so in a spirit of Christian love, meekness, and candour for Christ Jesus' sake.

Our first step then will be to see, what *proofs* the Roman Church brings forward to support her pretensions. In turning to the index of the Rhemish Testament, I find four texts referred to, upon which this doctrine appears to be built—the same texts are adduced by Dr. Wiseman in his Lectures, and the same are depended upon, in this little book, page 52.

“Q. How do you prove St. Peter's supremacy?”

“A. 1st, From the very name of Peter, or Cephas, which signifies a rock, which name, our Lord, who does nothing without reason, gave to him, who before was called Simon, to signify that he should be as the rock or foundation, upon which he would build his Church, according to what he himself declared, Matt. xvi. 18, when he told him, ‘Thou art Peter, (this is a rock,) and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.’

“2nd, From the following words, Matt. xvi. 19, ‘I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven’—Where, under the figure of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, our Lord ensured to Peter the chief authority in his Church: as when a king gives to one of his officers the keys of a city, he thereby declares that he makes him governor of that city.

“3rdly, From Luke xxii. 31, 32, the Lord said, ‘Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.’ In which text our Lord not only declared his particular concern for Peter, in praying for him, that his faith might not fail, but also committed to him the care of his brethren, the other apostles, in charging him to confirm, or strengthen them.

“4thly, From John xxi. 15, &c. Jesus saith to Simon “Peter, ‘Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than “these? He saith to him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest “that I love thee. He saith to him, Feed my lambs. He “saith to him the second time, Simon, son of John, lovest “thou me? He saith to him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest “that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. “He saith unto him a third time, Simon, son of John, “lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said “unto him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said “unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest “that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my “sheep.’ In which text, our Lord, in a most solemn “manner, thrice committed to St. Peter the care of his “whole flock, of all his sheep without exception, that is “of his whole Church.”

Such are the direct arguments from Scripture, by which this doctrine is attempted to be supported. We will now examine them, and see whether they bear such a signification, as is attempted to be put upon them. Romanists declare, in the Creed of Pope Pius IV. “I “also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense “which our holy mother, the Church, has held, and does “hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense “and interpretation of Scriptures; neither will I ever “take and interpret them, otherwise than according to “the unanimous consent of the Fathers.” Now, if ever there were a subject, upon which we might expect the Fathers to be unanimous, according to Romanist views, it would be this—we will consider the opinions of some of the principal of them.

The first we will take is St. JEROME, who lived and wrote about the year 400 after Christ, and whose descriptions of the City of Rome, and of the Catholic Church are so often quoted by Romanists, as if they referred to their own particular system, instead of the whole Christian body, throughout the world, in opposition to those sects which had sprung up at various times within the borders of the Church. What says JEROME?—“The Catholic Church is founded, “with a firm root, upon *the rock Christ*.”—(Ad. Princ. Virg. tom. iii. p. 173).

St. CYPRIAN says, *Christ himself is the rock.*—(Epis. 63.)

St. CHRYSOSTOM.—Upon this *rock*, that is the *faith* of his confession: and again—on this *rock*, not upon Peter, for he did not build his Church upon the man, but upon his *faith*.

St. BASIL of Seleucia.—His *confession* is the *rock* of religion, the basis of salvation, the bulwark of the faith, and the foundation of truth; for “other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.”—(23rd Hom.)

St. HILARY.—There is one immoveable foundation of the faith, this our *blessed rock confessed*, by the mouth of Peter.—“Thou art the Son of the living God.”—(Trac. Trin.)

ORIGEN, one of the most learned men of his age, in commenting on the passage, says—But if thou think that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter only, what will you say of John, and each of the apostles? Shall we dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter in particular, and that they should prevail against the rest of the apostles?

St. AMBROSE.—*Faith*, therefore, is the foundation of the Church, for it was not said of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.—(On the Incar. ch. 5.)

St. AUGUSTINE.—Jesus saith not, *Thou art the rock*, but, *Thou art Peter*. The *rock* was *Christ* whom Peter confessed (Aug. Ret. I. 12); and again, in a sermon on the passage, AUGUSTINE says—Upon this *rock*, which thou hast confessed; upon this *rock* which thou hast known, saying, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, I will build my Church; *upon myself*, who am the Son of the living God, will I build my Church; upon *me* will I build thee, not me upon *thee*.

Here is a small sample of what every Romanist professes, I may say *swears*, to believe in, the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers! Where is their unanimity? Though I have only mentioned eight of them, yet we find them differing among themselves upon this passage, according to the Roman view, some holding the opinion that Peter's *confession* was the rock; in which

view the celebrated historian Du Pin reckons that forty-four Fathers and Roman authors concurred, and the same interpretation was decreed by the general councils at Nice, Constantinople, Constance, and Basil, while several others of the councils, called general by the Roman Church, and number of the fathers, amongst others, St. Jerome, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, Origen, &c. insist that *Christ himself* was the rock and only foundation of the Church. In one thing, however, there is a unanimity, a oneness in their sentiments—they all condemn the view now held by the *modern Church of Rome*.

Having, in this way, enlisted upon our side that which Romanists hold to be superior to the words of Holy Writ—the church's interpretation by the mouth of the Fathers, it would appear almost unnecessary to proceed farther; but I shall endeavour not to leave them without examination, even to the risk of appearing tedious to some who may be well acquainted with this controversy; but, as it was the practice of our blessed Lord, to preach the gospel to the *poor*, it has always been the object of the Catholic Church to make the way of salvation plain to the humblest of her sons; and I should feel sorry that a single individual in this place should go forth, without being perfectly satisfied that the doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, on this subject, differ, as they do on other subjects, from the ancient faith of the Catholic Church as declared by the prophets and apostles in the Holy Scriptures of God.

Now, one of the best ways of coming at the meaning of a dark passage of Scripture, is to "compare spiritual things with spiritual;" to bring one passage to bear upon another: we shall do so with the passage upon which this doctrine of Peter's supremacy is built:—

"And I say to thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church."—*Matt. xvi. 18.*

"Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."—*Eph. ii. 20.*

"And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."—*Apoc. xxi. 14.*

"And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."—*Matt. xvi. 19.*

"He saith unto him again : Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him : Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him : *Feed my lambs.*"—*John xxi, 16.*

"Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."—*Matt. xxiii. 18.*

"Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to *rule the church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood."—*Acts x. 28.*

In the first of these, we have the same honor of being the foundation of Christianity put upon the other apostles and the prophets equally with Peter. In the second, the same authority is promised to them—whatever that may be—but which does not come within our design this evening, as was promised to Peter ; and, in the last, an equal commission is delegated to the clergy of the church of Ephesus, according to the authorised version, and a *greater* according to the Roman version of the Scriptures which translate the word which we call "*feed*" by "*rule*"—now, the office of ruling is higher than that of feeding ; and what follows? Why, that God the Holy Ghost gave the Ephesian clergy a higher rank than was committed to Peter.

But an objection is brought against this mode of reasoning—that where the same thing is at one time stated of a body, and at another of an individual, the latter is to be considered the superior—for example, all are commanded to *follow* Christ, and he called on Peter and the other apostles to *follow* him. And are we to consider that all Christians are equal to the apostles? To this I reply, that the word "*follow*" here must be taken in two different senses ; as any man of common understanding would, at once, perceive, all must follow Christ, in the example which He has left us. The twelve followed him as his immediate disciples. Another instance given is that of John, who is called the "*beloved*" disciple, though all are beloved. To this

I answer—shew me a text equally strong for Peter's supremacy, and I shall be inclined to submit. A third example is that of the Holy Spirit sending Paul and Barnabas upon a special mission, when all were sent into all the world, &c. The meaning here is plain; it was not a particular new commission, but a particular direction of the former mission—just as in the present day, a Roman priest, or a clergyman of our church, does not require to be re-ordained, when sent from one sphere of duty to another.

The last text relied upon is that which came third in the lists of texts quoted in the "Grounds of Christian Doctrine," (*Luke* xxii. 31, 32,) and it is argued, that because our Lord prayed for Peter, and directed him where he would once be converted to *confirm* his brethren, that this gives him a commanding situation over them; but I think, when we compare these verses with those quoted from *John* xxi., and consider what Peter's character was, we would be more likely to come at the truth. He appears to have been the most unstable of all the apostles—his faith, apparently strong, constantly failing—Satan continually having dominion over him, till at last he led him thrice to deny his Lord and Master. In this part of his history he has been, alas! too closely followed by those who claim him as their head, with this difference, however, that when Peter fell, grace enabled him to rise again. But where they have once permitted an error to be admitted into their system, their claim to infallibility precludes them from repentance. Such being the instability of Peter's character, he stood in need of more assistance than his brethren. None of them had so openly showed a want of faith as he; when walking on the waters he began to sink. To none of them had our Lord made use of that expression—"Go behind me, Satan," (*Matt.* xvi. 23.) except to him. Though "all forsook him and fled," yet none but Peter added a three-fold denial of his Lord. If our Lord had done nothing to reinstate him in the rank of an apostle, after thus three times passing on himself the sentence of excommunication, might not that other sentence naturally have been con-



sidered to have gone forth—"his bishopric let another take"—and so our Lord, willing to admit him again into the number of his chosen apostles, three times pronounced his re-admission. Then, when he was re-admitted, who so likely to be able, from experience, to confirm or edify the brethren, and to direct them where to look for help in the hour of need, as he who had himself so often fallen, and been raised again by Divine grace. And with regard to the three-fold commission in John xxi.—to feed his sheep—we have a pretty clear proof that it could not have had reference to a conferring of authority or honour, when we find Peter was "*grieved*" when the commission was about to be the third time repeated.

#### PRIMACY OF ST. PETER.—APOSTOLIC TESTIMONY.

I have endeavoured now to bring before you the strongest arguments relied upon by the upholders of this doctrine as to a direct commission to Peter to lord it over God's heritage; and I trust I have made it clear to your minds that the passages so much insisted upon do not, in their obvious meaning at least, support the view as held by our opponents; but there is another class of passages, from the Acts of the Apostles, which are pressed into the service, as showing how the apostles acted towards Peter, and how they submitted themselves to his jurisdiction. We have there, first, (*Acts* i. 15, "In those days Peter rising up in the midst of the brethren, said, &c.") Here, because Peter made a proposition to the disciples, which *they* carried into effect, therefore, he had a primacy!—rather inconclusive reasoning this, and contradicted too by the conclusion of the story; for if Peter were their prince and supreme head, surely, he would have at once made the selection of a successor to Judas, without allowing it to be decided by lot. Second—(*Acts* ii. 41.)—"They therefore that received his (Peter's) word, were baptized; and there were added in that day about three thousand souls." Third—(*Acts* xx. 44.) "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." Because in these two passages

the Lord is said to have blessed the preaching of Peter, therefore, he had a primacy! But, I would ask, which of the apostles did he not bless? And even, in the first of these two he was united with the other apostles; for it is said, (verse 14,) "Peter standing up *with the eleven*, lifted up his voice, &c."; and from the account of the miraculous gift of tongues, which had been just poured out upon them, and was not confined to Peter only, we must imagine that it was the preaching of all together that was so much blessed. Again, if we are to conceive the conversion of *three thousand* souls in one day being attributed to Peter, gives him a primacy, what are we to consider Jonah was entitled to, at whose preaching the whole city of Nineveh, containing, perhaps, three *millions* of inhabitants, together with the king, was induced to do penance, according to the Roman view, in sackcloth and ashes, and fasting for three whole days? Another way, in which these passages are commonly explained, may assist us in clearing up any difficulty that may be felt in them; while we deny Peter's supremacy, we do not deny that he may have had special marks of favour conferred upon him at times. Now, to him our Lord promised to give the power of the keys—a key is used for opening a lock—the way of life had been, as it were, hid, and Christ came "to bring life and immortality to light, through the Gospel." The circumstance mentioned in *Acts ii.* may be considered as the opening the door to the Jews, and that in *Acts x.* to the Gentiles; when Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, was admitted into the church, and Peter had the special honour of doing both. A fourth passage relied upon is *Acts vii. 14*, &c. "Now "when the apostles, who were in Jerusalem, had heard "that Samaria had received the word of God, *they sent unto them Peter and John.*" Whether this supports the Roman doctrine, or on the contrary, completely overturns it, and upholds the Catholic faith on the subject, I leave you to judge. What would you think of the College of Cardinals, if they heard that numbers of persons in England had been brought round to their system by the preaching of Dr. Wiseman, would they send the pope and another cardinal over

here to confirm these converts? or of the priests in and about Cootehill, sending Dr. Browne over to England for the same purpose? Would that prove their supremacy? No; but quite the contrary; for the person sent must be inferior to those who send him. But, perhaps we misunderstand the meaning of those passages, and there may be more in them than we think. Well, then, let us try if we cannot find out what the apostles and first disciples thought upon the matter.

1. St. Mark was a disciple of Peter. He calls him his son.—(1 *Peter*. v. 13.) He is said to have written his Gospel by Peter's dictation, (so that by some Fathers it is called the Gospel of Peter,) above thirty years after our Lord's ascension, when Peter's primacy must have been generally known and acknowledged—if it existed at all, and from Rome too—yet how does he uphold this primacy? He never mentions it; nor can a single text, in this Gospel, be perverted into the service.

2. A second witness I shall produce is Peter himself. He wrote two epistles; the first written—according to the Roman account—from Rome, fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, when he had been some years pope; and the second about twenty years after—just before his martyrdom—when we would expect him to point out his successor, and give directions for the management of the church, when he should be removed. But no such thing appears—he claims no supremacy—nor does he address those, to whom he writes, in the language of a superior, but speaking to the elders he says, (1 *Peter* v. 1,) “The ancients therefore that are “among you, I beseech (not much claim to superiority “here) who am myself also an ancient, and a witness “of the sufferings of Christ: as also a partaker of “that glory, which is to be revealed in time to come.” Here he modestly puts himself on a level with the ancients, as being himself an ancient or elder—as a witness of Christ's sufferings, the other apostles were on a level with him—and all true believers will be *partakers* of the glory to come.

3. My third witness is Paul: he wrote his epistle to the Romans about A.D. 58. By Romish account Peter

had been at that time ~~nine~~ years Bishop of Rome, and yet the letter was not addressed to him, which seems curious, nor "to the Church," as he does in 1 Cor. i. 2, which might make us suspect, that there was no regularly established Church at Rome, though 24 years after our Lord's ascension; but "to all that are at Rome, the beloved people of God, called to be saints," (Rom. i. 7.) Again, at the conclusion of the epistle, he sends salutations to twenty-nine persons by name, as well as some households, and yet Peter's name does not occur. Does it stand to reason that he was there at all at the time? I trow not.—Besides this, it would be an extraordinary proceeding for one Bishop to address a pastoral letter to the flock of another, and particularly for one, who made a boast that he did not preach the Gospel where it had been preached before, lest it might be said that he was building on another man's foundation.

4. Again I summon Paul before you—a few years after writing the above Epistle, he went himself to Rome, and from thence he wrote letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, the 2nd letter to Timothy, and to Philemon—Peter must then have been many years Pope—several names are mentioned throughout them with commendation, and yet the name of Peter never once occurs! Does this agree with the supposition, that he was then and there supreme in rank and dignity over Paul? But there is one passage that particularly requires explanation on the Romish supposition, (2 Tim. iv. 16,) "At my first answer no man stood with me, but *all forsook me.*" Here I give Romanists their choice; Peter was either then at Rome or he was not—if he were there, what do they think of the conduct of their supreme head—forsaking Paul in his distress? If he were not there—what becomes of his Popeship?

5. The next testimony I shall produce is that verse which I have selected for my text, Gal. ii. 11. "But when Cephas (Peter) was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." The circumstance here alluded to, occurred about twenty years after our Lord's ascension, when, if ever, Peter's primacy must have been well known; and yet

St. Paul's conduct is evidently very far from an acknowledgment of a supremacy in him, whom he withstood to the face, and spoke to *before them all* (verse 14), and agrees very little with the respect with which, according to the note in the Douay Version, an inferior may, and ought to admonish his superior. This epistle too, was written about five years after the circumstance occurred, so that Paul had full time to re-consider his conduct, and to have added some note or comment to prevent his being misunderstood; but none such appears.

6. I think I have pretty clearly shown that the apostolic testimony is against the claim of modern Rome, in behalf of the primacy in Peter; I shall add but one more argument, which may be called one of a more *negative* character, but which I think will shew *positively* that such claim is unfounded; and I shall do so by proving that if there were a primacy at all, it was in another apostle. We read in Acts xv. an account of a council of the apostles at Jerusalem, to consider certain matters.—You would expect; no doubt, that Peter, as their Prince, would take the chair as a matter of course, but such was not the case; James presided on the occasion, and Peter only spoke as one of the rest—neither opening the proceeding, for there had been “much disputing” (verse 7) before he began, and Paul and Barnabas spoke after him (verse 12); and when the decision was pronounced, St. JAMES says, “Men, Brethren, hear me;” he then rehearses the matter, and concludes by saying, “For which cause *I judge*,” or “*MY sentence is*,” &c. (verse 19). Again, Acts xii. 17, Peter himself sends a messenger to inform the Church of certain things that had happened to him, and he said, “Tell these things to JAMES “and to the Brethren.” Again, Acts xxi. 17, 18, “When we were come to Jerusalem, the Brethren received us gladly; and the day following Paul went in “with us *unto* JAMES, and all the elders were present.” Again, Gal. ii. 9, JAMES, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars—gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship.” Here, twenty-five years after our Lord's ascension, and yet James is put

before both Peter and John.\* If such passages as these, aye, or others not having quarter of their force, could be produced on the side of Peter's supremacy, we would never hear the end of them; but we allow supremacy in no man—we call no man master or father on earth; but if a primacy be claimed for any, let it be given to him who appears to have been acknowledged by the other apostles as their President.

#### WAS PETER BISHOP OF ROME?

I ~~trust~~ enough has now been said to shew that neither the declarations of our Lord nor the conduct of the apostles admitted any supremacy in Peter; but two questions remain yet to be considered, upon which much depends—was Peter ever the Bishop of Rome? and did he bequeath any superiority to his successors in that chair? The principal authority, upon which the fact of Peter's having been Bishop of Rome is founded, is a statement of Jerome, who says—"St Peter having preached at Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, proceeded to Rome in the second year of Claudius, and held the episcopal chair twenty-five years." Now, to this assertion we may answer—1st, that having been written about the year 400 after Christ, it is worth nothing unless it be confirmed by previous authors—now this it is not. 2nd. Eusebius, the father of ecclesiastical history, and who wrote about the year 250, or one hundred and fifty years before Jerome, is quite silent as to a supremacy, or as to the fact of Peter sitting in the chair of Rome; indeed, he clearly contradicts it when he says, "Peter is reported to have preached to the Jews dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and about the end of his days, tarrying at Rome, was crucified." Here he speaks of Peter's tarrying at Rome for a season—not of his sitting in the chair—the time about the end of his days—not for twenty-five years—and he merely states as a report what Jerome—who did not live for about a century and a half after him—asserts

---

\* Paul too lays claim to a supremacy, which was never claimed for Peter, *having the care of ALL the churches.*—2 Cor. xi. 28.

as a *fact*! In another place, Eusebius expressly asserts, that "Linus was first bishop of Rome." Peter must then have been *before the first*—that is—*never*.

3rd. Another ancient writer, who mentions the church at Rome, is Irenæus, who lived about a century before Eusebius, and who was the disciple of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, himself a disciple of the apostle John, and in his writings he speaks of "the universally known church, founded and constituted at Rome by the *two* most glorious *apostles, Peter and Paul*, who delivered "to Linus the bishopric to govern the church." By this statement Paul has as much claim among Romanists to a supremacy as Peter; but neither appears to have descended from his apostolic office to assume that of a diocesan bishop, and both seem to unite in committing the overseeing of the Roman Church to Linus.

4th. Indeed, I may add, that there does not appear any trace of any of the apostles thus descending to an inferior position; for, let the extent of the episcopacy be what it may, it must have been less extensive than that commission which they had received from their Lord—"Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the Gospel to *every creature*." 5th. The last argument I shall bring to bear upon this part of the subject is that derived from a comparison of Scripture and history. Jerome asserts that Peter was Bishop of Rome in the second year of the reign of the Emperor Claudius. Now the reign of Claudius began about the year of our Lord 40; so this must have been about A. D. 42; but in Acts xii. we have an account of the death of Herod, which we know occurred in the fourth year of Claudius, or A. D. 44; and we find, at the commencement of that chapter, that Peter was then at Jerusalem. Peter could not well be in two places at once. Again, in the ninth year of Claudius, A. D. 49, we are informed that all Jews were banished from Rome. Peter was a Jew, and it was not likely that he would be allowed to escape. Again, in Acts xv. 7, we are told that Paul found Peter at Jerusalem; and it does not appear that he came there especially; nor is any precedence given him, but rather the contrary; and all this happened about the 12th year of Claudius, or A. D. 52. It would look very extraordinary, if a council were to be held now

in Spain or Ireland, and the Pope to attend it, and yet that the historian should make no mention of his rank or station, but merely designate him by that name, by which he was known, previous to his exaltation to the episcopal dignity. And, again, in the year 63, we find Paul going to Rome, dwelling there in his own hired house—and never in all his letters from that place mentioning Peter's name, or making any allusion to him, unless, indeed, we consider his dwelling, in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, upon that part of a bishop's character in which Peter must have sadly failed, if he were at Rome at that time—that of being “given to hospitality,” (1 Tim. iii. 2,) “a lover of hospitality.” (Tit. i. 8.)

I think I have now succeeded in proving to your satisfaction, both from Scripture and history, that Peter never was Bishop of Rome, and so might naturally be expected to conclude; but there remain some few arguments to be answered yet, especially that founded upon the supposed practice of the church, in the early ages; for though it would appear from what has been said, that Peter had no supremacy to bequeath, yet it may be argued, that, perhaps, we do not understand those things as well as those who lived in the apostles' times, and in the ages immediately succeeding them, and that if we find them acknowledging a supremacy to the Bishops of Rome, we should do so likewise. We, as members of the Catholic Church, can have no objection to this appeal to history; for we know what the practice of the ancient Catholic Church was. If the Bishop of Rome were the supreme head of the church, we, of course, would expect that all controversies should be decided by his word, and that no other tribunal should be on a level with him. Controversies did arise, and how were they decided? Take that concerning the time of celebrating Easter, which arose in the second century. Eusebius tells us, (in his 5th book,) “a synod for this cause assembled in Palestine, of whom Theophilus, Bishop of Cæsarea, and Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, were chief. At Rome there was a synod also gathered together for the same cause, whereof Victor, their bishop, was president. Again,



“there was another of the Bishops of Pontus, where Paulinus, as the senior, did preside; and another of the bishops of France, which Irenæus did superintend.” Here, there is no superior value given to the decision of the Roman synod and her bishop; but Jerusalem, France, and Pontus, are placed upon the same level. Not only so, but a few years afterwards, whilst the differences still continued to exist, Victor, the Roman Pontiff, thinks proper to excommunicate the Asiatic churches, because they did not agree in his opinion, and the consequence was, that several western bishops, we are told, sharply reprehended him, and amongst the rest, Irenæus, who wrote a strong and rebuking letter to him on the subject, condemning his assumption, though he agreed with his opinion. Again, about a century later, when Stephen was Bishop of Rome, a controversy arose between him and Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, upon the subject of re-baptizing heretics. The dispute proceeded to a great length, and yet no claim to supremacy was asserted on either side. This little accords with the idea, that the Bishop of Rome was then supreme head of the church. But it is objected—how is it possible that this supremacy, which has been acknowledged by so large a body of professing Christians,—how is it possible that this supremacy could have sprung up, if it had not been established by Christ’s ordinance? This, however, is easily answered. It did not spring up to full maturity at once: it crept on by degrees scarcely perceptible. At the time of our Lord’s appearance upon earth, Rome commanded the world—her emperor ruled all nations. In size, in wealth, in population, she was unrivalled. There was no such city then in existence, and she had frequent and constant communication with every part of the habitable globe; consequently, those, who had authority there, would naturally be looked up to, and have a kind of precedence admitted. When Christianity was first planted there, no doubt, a man, discreet and wise, was selected to fill the bishop’s seat—any matters that became subject of controversy, in any of the most distant parts of the empire, would soon be heard of and discussed among the Christians; and as there were there devout men out of every nation under heaven, no

doubt, the opinion of such a body would be favourably received by the Brethren in other places ; but we have already seen that, for centuries, no supremacy was claimed. A change, however, came over the internal arrangements of the empire—the seat of power was removed from the city of Rome to Constantinople ; and when the emperor and the other great men left the city, the bishop naturally became a much more important personage ; and even when the empire was divided into the Eastern and Western, and an emperor again reigned in Rome, the power of the bishop had become too deeply rooted to be easily overturned—still no claim to supremacy was set forth ; and this is plain from the decrees of certain councils held in those days. If the Bishop of Rome were the supreme head of the church, he ought to have presided at all councils, and suffered no infringement of his rights, yet in A.D. 325, at the Council of Nice, Eustatius, Bishop of Antioch, filled the chair, and a decree was passed, declaring the Bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, to be equal in point of rank and precedence. In 431, at the Council of Ephesus, it was Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, who presided, and not the Bishop of Rome. And at the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, the Bishops of Constantinople and Rome were declared to have the same rank and authority. Now, mark, this did not give these bishops a supremacy over other bishops, but merely settled their rank, just as in the Church of Ireland, the bishop of this Diocese (Meath) takes precedence of all the other bishops, though he may be the last appointed among them, whilst the others are ranked according to the dates of their consecrations. The spirit of pride, however, was working in the minds of men, who should have been examples of humility. The Bishop of Constantinople, towards the close of the sixth century, arrogated to himself the title of Universal, or Catholic Bishop, and claimed to be the supreme head of the church on earth. What say the Bishops of Rome to this ? Pelagius I. declared it to be a profane appellation. Gregory I. uses stronger language, for in writing to the Emperor Maurice, he says—“I faithfully declare, that whosoever in his

"haughtiness shall call himself, or desire to be called,  
 "the Universal Bishop, is the forerunner of Antichrist;"  
 and his language in addressing the usurping bishop is,  
 if possible, stronger still—"What wilt thou answer  
 "unto Christ, who is the true head of the universal  
 "church, in the day of judgment, seeing that by this  
 "name 'Universal,' thou seekest to enthrall all the  
 "members of his body to thyself? Whom dost thou  
 "imitate herein, save Lucifer, who, in contempt of  
 "those legions of angels who were his fellows, sought  
 "to mount aloft to the top of singularity, where he  
 "might be subject to none, and all might be subject  
 "to him?" A few years, however, rolled by, and a  
 man of a different spirit sat in the Roman Chair. The  
 Emperor Maurice was murdered by Phocas, with cir-  
 cumstances of great aggravation; the murderer seized  
 the reins of government, and in the year 606, the  
 Bishop of Rome, Boniface the Third, received the  
 title of Universal Bishop from the blood-stained hands  
 of this usurper. Such was the origin of this title  
 which we are called upon to admit, and of the claim  
 of supremacy to which we are commanded to submit.  
 But should this claim be ever asserted in the presence  
 of any whom I now have the privilege of addressing,  
 let them give to the objector this short and simple  
 answer—*your claim comes just six hundred years too*  
*late*. I might now conclude; but even at the risk of  
 wearying you, it may be well to show you how this  
 was admitted in after ages. The two chief Bishops or  
 Patriarchs of the church at this time were—as has been  
 already said—those of Constantinople and Rome; the  
 former superintending the eastern, and the latter  
 the western division of the Roman empire; but neither  
 of them admitted the supremacy of the other; so  
 far from it, there was a constant spirit of rivalry  
 between them, till at length in the year 862 the two  
 Patriarchs entirely withdrew from each other's com-  
 munion. Here was a time for the universal Church  
 to declare her sentiments upon the claim of supremacy,  
 and we naturally suppose that if the case on behalf of  
 Rome were well founded, the Bishop of Constantinople  
 would have been left alone, or nearly so—yet what was

the fact? A few years previously, a calculation had been made of the number of Bishops in two divisions of the empire, from which it appeared that there were about *one thousand* in the Eastern and *six thousand* in the Western. The whole of the former adhered to Constantinople, whilst many of the latter, especially the French, British and Irish Bishops, protested against the claim of the Roman Patriarch, so that it is probable that the number of Bishops who continued in connexion with the Greek Church were more than double the number of those who acknowledge the supremacy of Rome, and yet the latter then and since has arrogated to herself the title of Catholic or Universal!—with how little reason I trust you will all now plainly see. Rome, however, did not remain stationary; supremacy she aimed at, and get it she must, let the means be what they may. While the Mohammedan power was overrunning the Eastern division of the Church, Rome was gradually encroaching on the liberties of the various Churches in the West; one by one they were falling before her—some struggled longer than others, and some never submitted to her sway. Ireland was one of these: her Church, founded in apostolic times, if not by one of the apostles themselves, had continued free and independent, shedding abroad a light upon the world, when the rest of Europe was shrouded in darkness. Many attempts were made to reduce her to submission; but we have the testimony of Pope Adrian IV. himself, that to the year 1155 (when he published his celebrated Bull, giving permission to Henry II. King of England, to conquer Ireland,) Ireland had always protested against the usurpations of the See of Rome. Henry acted upon this grant; his troops were landed in our Island—divisions amongst our native Chiefs aided his ambitious views, and at length having obliged the greater part of the country to submit, a Synod was held in Cashel in the year 1172, when, by the influence of British lances and Roman gold, a number of Irish Bishops, for the first time, admitted their subjection to the See of Rome. But mark, this was not the unanimous voice of the Irish Church; all her Bishops were not present; many held out; the decrees

of this Synod were acknowledged but little beyond the English pale. By degrees, however, the arts of Rome prevailed; her influence was increasing through the land, till at length after the lapse of about four hundred years, the spark of independence was nearly extinct. But it was not suffered to expire—the cry of Reform which arose in Germany was wafted to our shores—the dying spark was kindled to a flame, and the Church of Ireland again asserted her independence, while two only of her Bishops refused to join their Brethren in regaining their freedom. And we may add—that even had the light of independence been entirely extinguished, the same power which, in the 12th century, could pass a law by a small majority, could, in the 16th, repeal such a law.

I trust it has now been satisfactorily proved that the supremacy of Peter or of the Roman Church is unsupported by either Scripture or history—and I shall now merely bring forward a few texts to shew that such a claim is likewise contrary to the written word of God. 1st. The title “Head of the Church” is unscriptural when applied to any human being—Christ alone is the Head, as you may find in Eph. i. 22. “And he hath subjected all things under his feet, and *hath made Him head over all the Church.*” Col. i. 18. “And *He is the head* of the body, the Church;” and many other passages there are to a similar purport, where such a title is applied to Christ and Christ alone. And here it may be well for me to remark, that where some persons tell us that the Sovereign of England is called the Head of the Church, they only show their ignorance of the subject, for no such title is admitted by the Church of England and Ireland; the mistake originating perhaps in the fact that Henry VIII. who never freed himself from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, did for a time assume the name, in imitation of the Roman Bishop. 2nd. Again we have in Eph. iv. 11, a list of Church Officers, as we may call them, and it seems very extraordinary that the name of Pope does not occur amongst them. If a Romish writer of the present day were to enumerate the various officers in the Church, it would appear very

remarkable if he were to say, they consisted of Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, &c. &c. and never mention the Pope. I am inclined to think that such writer would not be in very high favour with his Holiness. 3rd. We have the express declaration of our Lord as to the equality of all the apostles. Matt. xvi. 18, is claimed as the proof of a supremacy of Peter, and yet we find our Lord in the same Gospel (ch. xviii. xx. and xxiii.) deciding the point of precedence amongst the Apostles, not by telling them that Peter was their Prince, but by setting up a child in the midst of them, and informing them that they must become humble as little children, or they should never enter into the kingdom of heaven—and when in Matt xx. 20, the mother of Zebedee's children besought the Lord to exalt them above their brethren—we are told (verse 24,) that the *ten* were moved with indignation, and not Peter only, plainly shewing that the Apostles never understood, that the commission to Peter gave him a precedence over the rest. 4th. Another remarkable passage, (2 Thess. ii. 4,) however shews us from whence this claim of supremacy arises, and to what it tends—a great apostacy or falling away from the truth is foretold in many parts of God's word, and we here find the claim set forth, as one of the great marks or tokens of this apostacy—we read of one who is called, “the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth, and is lifted up above all, that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God.” Now we know that earthly rulers are “called god,” and where is the line of Sovereigns that ever sought to lord it over kings in the manner in which the Bishop of Rome has done for centuries. We find Pope Zachary in the eighth century taking away the Kingdom of France from Childric III. and giving it to Pepin, the Mayor of his palace. Gregory VII. excommunicated Henry IV. Emperor of Germany, and obliged him to remain at his gate three days barefoot, and fasting, before he absolved him—conduct not very becoming in one who professes to be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus. Pope Adrian IV. (he who made a present of

Ireland to the English King at the very time that he acknowledged that it had never belonged to him) commanded another Emperor, Frederic Barbarossa, to hold his stirrup while he mounted his horse—a new mode of inculcating Christian humility!—but it is unnecessary to multiply instances—even if they could not be procured, we have the claim asserted by the Popes themselves and their followers, up to the present day. But a more remarkable fulfilment, more literal, and what brings it home, even with more effect, to the Bishop of Rome, is, the custom at certain times for “his Holiness,” as he is blasphemously called, being lifted up and sitting on the high altar of St. Peter’s at Rome. Here *he actually sits above the wafer*, which is “called God,” and “which is worshipped” by those who are induced to believe that it is really changed into the body, soul, and divinity of our blessed Lord; and thus in a most extraordinary and palpable manner is this charge brought home to him who thus so plainly answers the description.

In conclusion, I would address a word of exhortation to those of my hearers who are members of the Roman Church. You have heard with patience and attention, for which I thank you, the various interesting addresses which have been made from this place during the last few weeks. You have heard the doctrines of the Old Catholic Church, and the way of salvation pointed out by Prophets and Apostles contrasted with the doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, and the various new devices which she sets forth to lead her votaries, not to heaven, but to some place unheard of in the word of God, or for some hundred years after the ascension of our Lord. Oh! take warning before it is too late. If we speak truth—and *we are ready to defend what we assert*—the doctrines taught by your Church are not those of the apostles; and St. Paul tells us, Gal. i. 8, “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” Again, in his epistle to the ancient Church of Rome, xvi. 17, he beseeches the brethren to “mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and

“avoid them.” The Church of Rome in this country has taught and does teach doctrines contrary to those of St. Paul, and has caused dissensions and offences too. Your duty then is manifest—it is declared in a voice from heaven, saying in the Apoc. xviii. 4.—“Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues.” I ask you not to leave her and then wander like the dove from the ark, without finding a place whereon to set your foot, but I invite you, from this place, to join yourselves to us, to become members of

“That ancient church, the Irish church,

“Descended by a line

“Of Deacons, Priests, and Bishops too,

“From the apostles’ time”—

a church which takes the unerring word of God as her only rule of faith, believing that He “who cannot lie” knew best what was sufficient to direct us. She is ready to receive back into her bosom all who are willing to return, and we, as her ministers, are ready and willing, at all times, more fully to instruct those, who come to us for instruction, and to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us. But be not deceived—being a member of one church, or another church—being called by this name or that, will never render us more acceptable in the sight of God. We must be saved by the blood of Jesus, and that only, and not by the church or party to which we may have attached ourselves; and may all who now hear me be led, by God’s grace, to flee for refuge to the hope set before us in the Gospel, and to seek for cleansing in that fountain opened for all sin and uncleanness—even in that blood which alone cleanseth from all sin.—Amen.



## WE LOVE THE CHURCH.

**WE** love the church, our mother church,  
 Established in the land;  
 In spite of ill-designing men,  
 She shall for ever stand:  
 Because she's founded on a rock,  
 Her corner stone is He,  
 The Lamb once slain, to save his church,  
 From all eternity.

**We** love the church, our mother church,  
 Her doctrines are so pure;  
 They stood the test of ages past,  
 And shall for aye endure.  
 They point the way a fallen race  
 May come to God by Him  
 Who died for them, on Calvary,  
 To take away their sin.

**We** love the church, the Irish church,  
 Descended by a line  
 Of Deacons, Priests, and Bishops too,  
 From the apostles' time.  
 Tho' nearly once invisible,  
 From error creeping in,  
 She now stands forth to wage a war  
 Against the man of sin.

**We** love the church, Catholic Church,  
 The spotless Saviour's bride;  
 Composed of all who hold the truth,  
 But on some points divide—  
 Who all unite, salvation's plan  
 To spread from shore to shore;  
 That all may know a Saviour's name,  
 A Saviour's name adore.



**FINIS.**



7



1



